

That was one of the more remarkable panels we have ever had. Judge Alito has served with Republicans and Democrats—experienced judges, extraordinarily wise, very interesting to listen to, and their respect for him was remarkable.

Indeed, the ABA panel member—an African American who represented the University of Michigan in the affirmative action admissions case which went before the Supreme Court—said that Judge Alito was “held in incredibly high regard” by the ABA.

I will share a few words from Judge Alito himself before I wrap up.

In his testimony, he was asked about cases that may come before him. I have to say nobody would dispute that in recent years he was more forthcoming than any nominee we have had in discussing openly how he would analyze a case, without going too far and prejudging it in any way. He said these words, which I think reflect good judgment and wisdom of judgment.

By the way, we have a transcript, but all of this was without notes. He spoke so beautifully. He looked right at us.

This is what he said:

Good judges develop certain habits in mind. One of those habits in mind is to have a delay in reaching a conclusion until everything has been considered. Good judges are always open to the possibility of changing their minds based on the next brief that they read, or the next argument that is made by an attorney who is appearing before them, or a comment that is made by a colleague during the conference on the case when the judges privately fully discuss the case.

That is what we want in a judge. We want a judge who comes in with a philosophy and a demonstrated record of not rushing to judgment, not allowing any personal views he may have to influence him. He analyzes a case, but has a record that has won the respect of colleagues, liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, the bar, and his colleagues on the bench.

He is an extraordinary nominee. I could not be more proud of him. He did a magnificent job in testifying. I never thought that anyone would testify to the level of John Roberts because he is such a skilled attorney and advocate. But this judge in his own way was every bit as good. He made us all proud, and President Bush should be very proud for submitting his nomination.

I am pleased to support him. I will be voting for him, and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a

period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION ON CAMBODIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I commend the majority leader for offering an important resolution on Cambodia yesterday that expressed concern with the systematic campaign by Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to undermine democracy and the rule of law in that country.

Scholars can argue when this campaign was initiated—after U.N.-sponsored elections in 1993 or before the coup d’etat in 1997—but no one disputes that it culminated early this year in the arrest of human rights leader Kem Sokha and other reformers in Phnom Penh on charges of defaming the Prime Minister.

As the resolution points out, no sector in Cambodia has been spared in this campaign.

Opposition leader Sam Rainsy was stripped of his parliamentary immunity last year and sentenced to 18 months in absentia for defaming the Prime Minister.

Radio journalist Mom Sonando was arrested for criminal defamation.

Even Rong Chhum, president of the Cambodian Independent Teachers Association, was similarly charged.

To be sure, other champions of freedom in Cambodia have suffered worse fates. Former parliamentarian Om Radsady and labor leader Chea Vichea were brutally murdered by unknown assailants. Justice remains similarly elusive for a grenade attack against a conference hosted by the Buddhist Liberal Democratic Party in 1995 and a more brutal attack against a peaceful rally organized by the Khmer Nation Party—headed by Sam Rainsy—in 1997.

The immediate and strong condemnation of the arrest of Sokha and his colleagues by international donors and multilateral organizations, including the United Nations and the World Bank, is certainly welcomed. U.S. Ambassador Joe Mussomeli and Deputy Chief of Mission Mark Storella deserve praise for standing by Sokha throughout the crisis. Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill’s trip to the region succeeded in freeing Sokha from prison, and I know he cringes at Hun Sen’s characterization of Sokha’s release as a “gift”. This may have been simply a poor choice of words, but it serves to affirm the world’s perception of Hun Sen as a Southeast Asian dictator.

The news that Hun Sen will drop charges against Sokha and other civil society reformers is not a cause for celebration. History shows that Hun Sen is a habitual offender, and we can expect continued harassment and intimidation against those championing freedom and the rule of law.

The international community must now turn its attention to the plight of Sam Rainsy, Cheam Channy and other political prisoners. It is time for His Majesty King Sihamoni to derail Hun Sen’s campaign by immediately pardoning Rainsy, Channy, and all other political prisoners. Only then will democracy have a chance to get back on track in Cambodia.

The challenge for Cambodia’s many donors is straightforward: hold Hun Sen and his government accountable for their actions. While this may require some soul searching by U.S. allies, particularly France, Germany, and Japan, the status quo in Cambodia serves only the interests of Hun Sen and the ruling Cambodian People’s Party. With a donor’s conference approaching in March 2006, the international community must demand a return on the significant assistance provided to Cambodia.

As over \$2 billion has been invested in the democratic development of that country since the 1991 Paris Peace Accords, it is not too much for the international community to demand that the Prime Minister and his government conduct themselves in a manner that respects the constitutional rights and dignity of the people of the Cambodia.

LISTENING TO TEENS ABOUT GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the 2005 Teen Gun Survey conducted by the Uhlich Children’s Advantage Network, also known as UCAN, produced some very interesting and troubling results. UCAN conducts this survey each year as a way of measuring teens’ attitudes about gun violence. For 2005, the sample included nearly 1,000 teenagers from around the country who responded to a variety of questions about their exposure to gun violence and its impact on their lives.

The UCAN survey makes clear that far too many teens are exposed to gun violence. According to the survey, nearly half of the respondents personally know someone who has been shot, and more than a third know another teenager who has threatened to kill someone with a gun. Almost one out of every five teenagers who responded said they heard gunshots in their neighborhood at least once a month, and 38 percent believe they could get a handgun if they wanted to. Disturbingly, 39 percent of the respondents fear they will be shot someday.

The results of the survey also raise significant concerns about the perceived safety of our schools. More than a third of respondents said that they are afraid gun violence might take place in their school, and 21 percent feel that they are safer away from school than when they are in school.

These results should be taken seriously. Many teens who are exposed to gun violence may turn to violence later in life. A study completed last year by a University of Michigan researcher